REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 17-18 have been cancelled, and claims 3-11, 13-14, 16, 19-27, 29-30, and 32-34 have been amended. In particular, claims 3, 10, 11, 19, 25 and 26 have been re-written in independent form, and independent claims 33 and 34 have been amended to recite the same features found in the other independent claims. Claims 3-16 and 19-34 are pending.

The Examiner and his supervisor are thanked for their participation in a telephone interview on January 8. During the interview, it was suggested by the Examiner's supervisor that an amendment along the lines of this amendment be submitted for consideration. The substance of the discussion leading to this suggestion is described below.

In the Office Action, claims 9, 10, 25 and 26 were indicated to be allowable if re-written in independent form. This action has been taken, and thus these claims are now seen to be allowable.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8, 11-24 and 27-34 were rejected as being unpatentable in view of Microsoft Windows NT Screen Shots and Griesmer, US 5,923,328. Claims 1-2 and 17-18 have been cancelled; claims 3 and 19 have been re-written in independent form; independent claims 33 and 34 have been amended to include the features recited in claims 3 and 19, and the remaining dependent claims have been amended to depend from claim 3 or 19 as appropriate. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to these claims as amended.

As discussed during the above-mentioned interview, claim 3 is a method for representing a resource in a computing system environment and includes (1) assigning an object identifier to an object, the object identifier including at least a simple name of the object and a home of the object, the home of the object being assigned as a home location identifying the home object for the object in object hierarchy, (2) assigning a suffix to the home of the object if the home of the object is not unique in the computing system environment, such that object identifiers for objects having a home that is not unique will be different

from each other based on the suffix, and displaying a representation of the object on a graphical user interface. The displayed representation includes the simple name of the object. Also, if a home condition exists for the representation of the object, the home and assigned suffix of the object are included in the displayed representation of the object, and if a home condition does not exist, the home and suffix of the object are omitted from the displayed representation of the object. This method enables the hierarchical display of objects in an unambiguous manner, even if they have home locations that have the same home names.

As discussed at the interview, neither the Windows Screen Shots nor Griesmer is seen to teach or suggest the above-recited features of claim 3. The Office has in fact noted that such features are not shown in Windows Screen Shots. With respect to Griesmer, it is seen to show a computer displaying resources (such as storage locations identified by directory names) existing both on the computer (i.e. local) and on other computers within a Windows local area network (LAN). Examples include the "Time" directory which exists both on the local computer and on a computer named "Main". The Time directory on Main is also identified by a device designator "T:". However, there is not seen to be any suffix that is used to differentiate two directories on two same-named computers, and in fact as discussed during the interview such a situation is believed to not be possible. In a Windows network, two different computers cannot be given the same name, and therefore it is not possible that two different objects would be displayed with both the same directory name (e.g. Time) and the same computer name (e.g. Main). Thus, no suffix to differentiate such displayed objects is necessary, and indeed none is seen in Griesmer.

Based on the foregoing, it is believed that claim 3 is allowable in view of the cited references. It will be seen that the other claims incorporate similar features, either directly or indirectly, and therefore the remaining claims are seen to be allowable as well.

Favorable action is respectfully requested. If there are any issues remaining after this amendment, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned attorney if that will facilitate their resolution.

If the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office deems a fee necessary, this fee may be charged to the account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

James F. Thompson
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 36,699
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805
Customer No.: 022468

Attorney Docket No.: EMC01-08(01043)

Dated: February 10, 2005